

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/511,511	EMMERT-BUCK ET AL.
	Examiner Christine Foster	Art Unit 1641

All Participants:

(1) Christine Foster.

Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____

(2) Karri Bradley.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 4/11/07

Time: 4:30 PM

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

3-4, 17, and 19

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The Examiner contacted Applicant's representative for clarification regarding the election of species of a targeting moiety. Applicant's reply indicates that "antibody binding domain" was elected (see page 8); however, it was not clear whether Applicant intended to elect species (i) or (ii) as set forth on page 4 of the restriction requirement, which correspond to claims 3 and 4, respectively.

Ms. Bradley clarified that Applicant has elected species (i) of a "Variable region of an antibody binding domain" as in claim 3, and that claim 4 should be withdrawn as indicated on page 8 of Applicant's response.

The Examiner also indicated that claims 17 and 19 would also be withdrawn from consideration as they do not read on the elected species of targeting moiety and/or active moiety. Specifically, claim 17 appears to relate only to nucleic acid embodiments not elected for consideration, and claim 19 relates to the generalized targeting moiety corresponding to species (ii), which was not elected for consideration.